



RECEIVED

FEB 25 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

Attorney Docket No.: FC01402

Serial No.: 09/981,197

Filing Date: October 16, 2001

Inventor: John W. Davis et al.

PTO/SB92 (08-00)

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it contains a valid OMB control number.

Certificate of Mailing under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

**Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231**

RECEIVED
FEB 25 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

on February 13, 2003

Date

Signature

Robert A. Franks

Typed or printed name of person of signing Certificate

Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of mailing, or this certificate must identify each submitted paper.

Documents enclosed:


Response (3 pages)

Formal drawings (12 sheets) - in duplicate

Copies of: US 4,674,204; US 4,910,886; and US 2002/0007569 A1

Post card receipt

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.03 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U. S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.



RECEIVED

FEB 25 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

CASE NO. FC01402

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

John W. Davis et al.

Application No. 09/981,197

Art Unit: 3728

Filed: October 16, 2001

Examiner: J. Kavanaugh

For: INSERT MOLDING APPARATUS AND METHOD

Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

RECEIVED

FEB 25 2003

Sir:

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

RESPONSE

In response to the Office Action mailed on January 16, 2003 for the subject application, applicants respectfully request consideration of the following remarks.

The Office Action imposed a requirement for restriction of the pending claims, considered to include three "inventions" grouped as follows:

Group I: claims 1-7 directed to apparatus for molding;

Group II: claims 8-13 directed to a method for molding; and

Group III: claims 14-16 directed to an insole.

Applicants submit that this restriction requirement is improper, as it does not comply with guidelines promulgated by the Office in M.P.E.P. § 802.01, which states that inventions are distinct if they "are capable of separate manufacture, use, or sale as claimed, AND ARE PATENTABLE (novel and unobvious) OVER EACH OTHER..." The Office Action provides no evidence that the matter of separate patentability was given consideration; only factors regarding the separate manufacture and use issues are discussed.

3/20
#5
My
Pres.
W
Wings
att
C. J. Kavanagh
2/27/03

Moreover, the M.P.E.P. (in § 803) provides guidance concerning the criteria for restriction: (A) the inventions must be independent or distinct; and (B) there must be a serious burden on the examiner. It is stated that: "If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions." Indeed, it is not apparent to applicants just how the claims of Group II, directed to the method for molding, could possibly be examined without consulting the relevant apparatus art, since those method claims recite features of the particular apparatus which is required to be employed. Thus, only a single search should be required if all of claims 1-13 are simultaneously examined.

The fact that different claims would have different classifications does not dispose of the examination burden issue, since it is very common for a patent to have a number of classes and subclasses listed on its front. If all of the relevant art is readily available to the examiner, then differing classifications do not justify a restriction.


In view of the foregoing, applicants are willing to acquiesce to the restriction of the Group III claims, but respectfully urge reconsideration of the separation of Groups I and II. However, if the entire requirement is maintained, examination should proceed with the apparatus claims of Group I.

Enclosed is a new set of drawings, comprising twelve sheets and being submitted in duplicate. The originally filed drawings have been altered to conform to the formal requirements of the Office, and this new set should facilitate examination of the application.

Also enclosed are copies of the two U.S. patent documents (4,674,204 and 4,910,886) that are mentioned on page 1 of the application, and a copy of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0007569 A1 which corresponds to the pending application mentioned on page 7 of the present application. These documents may facilitate a better understanding of the invention.

As all of the pending claims are believed to be patentable, examination of the entire claim set and an early notification of their allowance are respectfully solicited. However, if any minor matters remain to be resolved before disposition of the application, kindly contact the undersigned to arrange for a telephonic or personal interview.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert A. Franks", with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

Robert A. Franks
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 28,605

Patent Department (K-6-1, 1990)
Schering-Plough Corporation
2000 Galloping Hill Road
Kenilworth, New Jersey 07033-0530
Telephone (908) 298-2908
Facsimile (908) 298-5388